

Initial Study Checklist

Date: December 18, 2002

LDR No. 42-0939

Name of Project: San Diego Inclusionary
Housing Ordinance

III. ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS:

The purpose of the Initial Study is to identify the potential for significant environmental impacts which could be associated with a project pursuant to Section 15063 of the State CEQA Guidelines. In addition, the Initial Study provides the lead agency with information which forms the basis for deciding whether to prepare an Environmental Impact Report, Negative Declaration or Mitigated Negative Declaration. This Checklist provides a means to facilitate early environmental assessment. However, subsequent to this preliminary review, modifications to the project may mitigate adverse impacts. All answers of "yes" and "maybe" indicate that there is a potential for significant environmental impacts and these determinations are explained in Section IV of the Initial Study.

Yes Maybe No

I. AESTHETICS / NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER – Will the proposal result in:

- | | | | |
|---|---|---|----------|
| A. The obstruction of any vista or scenic view from a public viewing area?
<u>The Ordinance would not result in any adverse effects to visual quality, aesthetics, or neighborhood character. The Ordinance is a mechanism to alter the market rate composition (sale or rental value) of residential units. Review for any potential impacts would be required for all development proposals at the time of application. Please see the Initial Study discussion for Neighborhood Character/Aesthetics.</u> | — | — | <u>X</u> |
| B. The creation of a negative aesthetic site or project?
<u>Please see I-A above.</u> | — | — | <u>X</u> |
| C. Project bulk, scale, materials, or style which would be incompatible with surrounding development?
<u>Please see I-A above.</u> | — | — | <u>X</u> |

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>Maybe</u>	<u>No</u>
D. Substantial alteration to the existing character of the area? <u>Please see I-A above.</u>	—	—	<u>X</u>
E. The loss of any distinctive or landmark tree(s), or a stand of mature trees? <u>Please see I-A above.</u>	—	—	<u>X</u>
F. Substantial change in topography or ground surface relief features? <u>Please see I-A above.</u>	—	—	<u>X</u>
G. The loss, covering or modification of any unique geologic or physical features such as a natural canyon, sandstone bluff, rock outcrop, or hillside with a slope in excess of 25 percent? <u>Please see I-A above.</u>	—	—	<u>X</u>
H. Substantial light or glare? <u>Please see I-A above.</u>	—	—	<u>X</u>
I. Substantial shading of other properties? <u>Please see I-A above.</u>	—	—	<u>X</u>
II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES / NATURAL RESOURCES / MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the proposal result in:			
A. The loss of availability of a known mineral resource (e.g., sand or gravel) that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? <u>The Ordinance would not result in the loss of agricultural resources, natural resources, and mineral resources. Review would be required for all development proposals at the time of application. Please see the Initial Study discussion for Natural Resources.</u>	—	—	<u>X</u>
B.			

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>Maybe</u>	<u>No</u>
C. The conversion of agricultural land to nonagricultural use or impairment of the agricultural productivity of agricultural land? <u>Please see II-A above.</u>	—	—	<u>X</u>
III. AIR QUALITY – Would the proposal:			
A. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? <u>The Ordinance would not result in any adverse effects to air quality. Review would be required for all development proposals at the time of application. Please see the Initial Study discussion for Air Quality.</u>	—	—	<u>X</u>
B. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? <u>Please see III-A above.</u>	—	—	<u>X</u>
C. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? <u>Please see III-A above.</u>	—	—	<u>X</u>
D. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? <u>Please see III-A above.</u>	—	—	<u>X</u>
E. Exceed 100 pounds per day of Particulate Matter 10 (dust)? <u>Please see III-A above.</u>	—	—	<u>X</u>
F. Alter air movement in the area of the project? <u>Please see III-A above.</u>	—	—	<u>X</u>
G. Cause a substantial alteration in moisture, or temperature, or any change in climate, either locally or regionally? <u>Please see III-A above.</u>	—	—	<u>X</u>

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>Maybe</u>	<u>No</u>
IV. BIOLOGY – Would the proposal result in:			
A. A reduction in the number of any unique, rare, endangered, sensitive, or fully protected species of plants or animals? <u>The Ordinance would not result in significant adverse effects to biological resources. Review would be required for all development proposals at the time of application. Please see the Initial Study discussion for Biological Resources.</u>	—	—	<u>X</u>
B. A substantial change in the diversity of any species of animals or plants? <u>Please see IV-A above.</u>	—	—	<u>X</u>
C. Introduction of invasive species of plants into the area? <u>Please see IV-A above.</u>	—	—	<u>X</u>
D. Interference with the movement of any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors? <u>Please see IV-A above.</u>	—	—	<u>X</u>
E. An impact to a sensitive habitat, including, but not limited to streamside vegetation, aquatic, riparian, oak woodland, coastal sage scrub or chaparral? <u>Please see IV-A above.</u>	—	—	<u>X</u>
F. An impact on City, State, or federally regulated wetlands (including, but not limited to, coastal salt marsh, vernal pool, lagoon, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption or other means? <u>Please see IV-A above.</u>	—	—	<u>X</u>
G. Conflict with the provisions of the City's Multiple Species Conservation Program Subarea Plan or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan? <u>Please see IV-A above.</u>	—	—	<u>X</u>

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>Maybe</u>	<u>No</u>
V. ENERGY – Would the proposal:			
A. Result in the use of excessive amounts of fuel or energy (e.g. natural gas)? <u>Implementation of the Ordinance would not result in adverse impacts to energy usage. Review would be required for all development proposals at the time of application. Please see the Initial Study discussion for Energy.</u>	—	—	<u>X</u>
B. Result in the use of excessive amounts of power? <u>Please see V-A above.</u>	—	—	<u>X</u>
VI. GEOLOGY/SOILS – Would the proposal:			
A. Expose people or property to geologic hazards such as earthquakes, landslides, mudslides, ground failure, or similar hazards? <u>Implementation of the Ordinance would not result in significant adverse effects to geology/soils. Review would be required for all development proposals at the time of application. Please see the Initial Study discussion for Geology/Soils.</u>	—	—	<u>X</u>
B. Result in a substantial increase in wind or water erosion of soils, either on or off the site? <u>Please see VI-A above.</u>	—	—	<u>X</u>
C. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? <u>Please see VI-A above.</u>	—	—	<u>X</u>
VII. HISTORICAL RESOURCES – Would the proposal result in:			
A. Alteration of or the destruction of a			

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>Maybe</u>	<u>No</u>
prehistoric or historic archaeological site? <u>Implementation of the Ordinance would not result in adverse effects to historical resources. Review would be required for all development proposals at the time of application. Please see initial study discussion for historical resources.</u>	—	—	<u>X</u>
B. Adverse physical or aesthetic effects to a prehistoric or historic building, structure, object, or site? <u>Please see VII-A above.</u>	—	—	<u>X</u>
C. Adverse physical or aesthetic effects to an architecturally significant building, structure, or object? <u>Please see VII-A above.</u>	—	—	<u>X</u>
D. Any impact to existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area? <u>Please see VII-A above.</u>	—	—	<u>X</u>
D. The disturbance of any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? <u>Please see VII-A above.</u>	—	—	<u>X</u>
VIII. HUMAN HEALTH / PUBLIC SAFETY / HAZARDOUS MATERIALS : Would the proposal:			
A. Create any known health hazard (excluding mental health)? <u>Adoption of the Ordinance would not result in adverse impacts to human health, public safety, or from hazardous materials. Review would be required for all development projects at the time of application. Please see the Initial Study discussion for Human Health and Public Safety.</u>	—	—	<u>X</u>
B. Expose people or the environment to a significant hazard through the routine			

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>Maybe</u>	<u>No</u>
transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials? <u>Please see VIII-A above.</u>	—	—	<u>X</u>
C. Create a future risk of an explosion or the release of hazardous substances (including but not limited to gas, oil, pesticides, chemicals, radiation, or explosives)? <u>Please see VIII-A above.</u>	—	—	<u>X</u>
D. Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? <u>Please see VIII-A above.</u>	—	—	<u>X</u>
E. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, create a significant hazard to the public or environment? <u>Please see VIII-A above.</u>	—	—	<u>X</u>
F. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? <u>Please see VIII-A above.</u>	—	—	<u>X</u>
IX. HYDROLOGY/WATER QUALITY – Would the proposal result in:			
A. An increase in pollutant discharges, including down stream sedimentation, to receiving waters during or following construction? Consider water quality parameters such as temperature dissolved oxygen, turbidity and other typical storm water pollutants. <u>Implementation of the Ordinance would not result in adverse effects to hydrology/water quality. Review would be required for all development proposals at the time of application.</u>	—	—	<u>X</u>

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>Maybe</u>	<u>No</u>
<u>Please see the Initial Study discussion for Hydrology/Water Quality.</u>			
B. An increase in impervious surfaces and associated increased runoff? <u>Please see IX-A above.</u>	—	—	<u>X</u>
C. Substantial alteration to on- and off-site drainage patterns due to changes in runoff flow rates or volumes? <u>Please see IX-A above.</u>	—	—	<u>X</u>
D. Discharge of identified pollutants to an already impaired water body (as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(b) list)? <u>Please see IX-A above.</u>	—	—	<u>X</u>
E. A potentially significant adverse impact on ground water quality? <u>Please see IX-A above.</u>	—	—	<u>X</u>
F. Cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses? <u>Please see IX-A above.</u>	—	—	<u>X</u>
X. LAND USE – Would the proposal result in:			
A. A land use which is inconsistent with the adopted community plan land use designation for the site or conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over a project? <u>Implementation of the Ordinance would not result in adverse effects to community plan land uses. Review would be required for all development proposals at the time of application. Please see the Initial Study discussion for Land Use.</u>	—	—	<u>X</u>
B. A conflict with the goals, objectives			

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>Maybe</u>	<u>No</u>
and recommendations of the community plan in which it is located? <u>Please see X-A above.</u>	—	—	<u>X</u>
C. A conflict with adopted environmental plans, including applicable habitat conservation plans adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect for the area? <u>Please see X-A above.</u>	—	—	<u>X</u>
D. Physically divide an established community? <u>Please see X-A above.</u>	—	—	<u>X</u>
E. Land uses which are not compatible with aircraft accident potential as defined by an adopted airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan? <u>Please see X-A above.</u>	—	—	<u>X</u>
XI. NOISE – Would the proposal result in:			
A. A significant increase in the existing ambient noise levels? <u>Implementation of the Ordinance would not result in noise impacts. Review of projects and the impacts from noise on the projects or the creation of noise impacts would occur at the time of application. Please see the Initial Study section on Noise.</u>	—	—	<u>X</u>
B. Exposure of people to noise levels which exceed the City's adopted noise ordinance? <u>Please see XI-A above.</u>	—	—	<u>X</u>
C. Exposure of people to current or future transportation noise levels which exceed standards established in the Transportation Element of the General Plan or an adopted airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan? <u>Please see XI-A above.</u>	—	—	<u>X</u>

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>Maybe</u>	<u>No</u>
<p>XII. PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES: Would the proposal impact a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? <u>Implementation of the Ordinance would not result in adverse effects to paleontological resources. Review would be required for potential impacts at the time of application. Please refer to the Initial Study discussion on Paleontological Resources.</u></p>	—	—	<u>X</u>
<p>XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING – Would the proposal:</p> <p>A. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? <u>The Ordinance would not substantially affect population growth or adversely affect housing. The Ordinance only provides a mechanism to alter the market rate composition of a percentage of dwelling units with a market rate versus an affordable housing rate. Review of any proposed development for the number of affordable units would occur at the of application. Please see the Initial Study discussion for Population and Housing. Please refer to the Initial Study discussions on land use and housing.</u></p>	—	—	<u>X</u>
<p>B. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? <u>Implementation of the Ordinance would not reduce or alter the number of existing dwelling units.</u></p>	—	—	<u>X</u>
<p>C. Alter the planned location, distribution, density or growth rate of the population of an area? <u>Implementation of the Ordinance would not result in any change in the density or distribution of the existing or future</u></p>	—	—	<u>X</u>

Yes Maybe No

population. The Ordinance would still require compliance with all zoning and development regulations as well as existing plans and policies.

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES – Would the proposal have an effect upon, or result in a need for new or altered governmental services in any of the following areas:

- | | | | |
|---|---|---|----------|
| A. Fire protection?
<u>The Ordinance would not result in the need for additional fire services. The Ordinance relates to the cost of dwelling units, not their location.</u> | — | — | <u>X</u> |
| B. Police protection?
<u>The Ordinance would not have a direct result in the need for additional police services or the re-allocation of existing services.</u> | — | — | <u>X</u> |
| C. Schools?
<u>The Ordinance would not result in the direct need for more schools or the way school allocations are developed.</u> | — | — | <u>X</u> |
| D. Parks or other recreational facilities?
<u>The Ordinance would not result in impacts to existing parks or the way the need for parkland is calculated.</u> | — | — | <u>X</u> |
| E. Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?
<u>The Ordinance would not result in the reduction of existing maintenance or the need for additional maintenance.</u> | — | — | <u>X</u> |
| F. Other governmental services?
<u>The Ordinance is a financing mechanism which would not result in the need for additional services.</u> | — | — | <u>X</u> |

XV. RECREATIONAL RESOURCES – Would the proposal result in:

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>Maybe</u>	<u>No</u>
<p>A. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? <u>Approval and implementation of the Ordinance would not adversely affect the availability of and/or need for new expanded recreational resources. Please see the Initial Study discussion for Recreational Resources.</u></p>	—	—	<u>X</u>
<p>B. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? <u>Please see XV-A above.</u></p>	—	—	<u>X</u>
<p>XVI. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION – Would the proposal result in:</p>			
<p>A. Traffic generation in excess of specific/ community plan allocation? <u>The project would not adversely affect the planned allocation of traffic, the existing circulation system or parking. As identified previously, the Ordinance is a financing mechanism for dwelling units. It does not increase the residential development in excess of what is currently allowed in the City's adopted plans, policies and development regulations. Review of development proposals would be required at the time of application. Please see Initial Study discussion for Traffic.</u></p>	—	—	<u>X</u>
<p>B. An increase in projected traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system? <u>Please see XVI-A above.</u></p>	—	—	<u>X</u>
<p>C. An increased demand for off-site parking? <u>Please see XVI-A above.</u></p>	—	—	<u>X</u>

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>Maybe</u>	<u>No</u>
D. Effects on existing parking? <u>Please see XVI-A above.</u>	—	—	<u>X</u>
E. Substantial impact upon existing or planned transportation systems? <u>Please see XVI-A above.</u>	—	—	<u>X</u>
F. Alterations to present circulation movements including effects on existing public access to beaches, parks, or other open space areas? <u>Please see XVI-A above.</u>	—	—	<u>X</u>
G. Increase in traffic hazards for motor vehicles, bicyclists or pedestrians due to a proposed, non-standard design feature (e.g., poor sight distance or driveway onto an access-restricted roadway)? <u>Please see XVI-A above.</u>	—	—	<u>X</u>
H. A conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation models (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? <u>Please see XVI-A above.</u>	—	—	<u>X</u>
XVII. UTILITIES – Would the proposal result in a need for new systems, or require substantial alterations to existing utilities, including:			
A. Natural gas? <u>Natural gas utilities are adequate. Please see Initial Study discussion for Utilities.</u>	—	—	<u>X</u>
B. Communications systems? <u>the Ordinance would not result in impacts to existing or the need for additional communications systems.</u>	—	—	<u>X</u>
C. Water? <u>The Ordinance would not have an impact on the existing water supply.</u>	—	—	<u>X</u>
D. Sewer? <u>The Ordinance would not have an impact of the existing sewer system.</u>	—	—	<u>X</u>

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>Maybe</u>	<u>No</u>
E. Storm water drainage? <u>The Ordinance would not have an impact on the existing storm water drainage system.</u>	—	—	<u>X</u>
F. Solid waste disposal? <u>The Ordinance would not impact the existing solid waste disposal system.</u>	—	—	<u>X</u>

XVIII. WATER CONSERVATION – Would the proposal result in:

A. Use of excessive amounts of water? <u>Approval and implementation of the Ordinance would not adversely affect water conservation. Please see the Initial Study discussion for Water Conservation.</u>	—	—	<u>X</u>
B. Landscaping which is predominantly non-drought resistant vegetation? <u>The Ordinance does not address the issue of landscaping. Any development would be required to comply with the City's adopted Landscape Technical Manual which encourages low water use vegetation.</u>	—	—	<u>X</u>

XIX. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:

A. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? <u>The Ordinance would not result in any adverse affects to biological or historical resources. Review for potential impacts would be required of all projects. The City has established policies and</u>	—	—	<u>X</u>
--	---	---	----------

Yes Maybe No

procedures for mitigating adverse impacts to resources. Please see the Initial Study discussion for Biology and Historical Resources.

- B. Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals? (A short-term impact on the environment is one which occurs in a relatively brief, definitive period of time while long-term impacts would endure well into the future.)

— — X

The Ordinance relates to the cost of dwelling units and would not result in long term adverse environmental effects.

- C. Does the project have impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (A project may impact on two or more separate resources where the impact on each resource is relatively small, but where the effect of the total of those impacts on the environment is significant.)

— — X

Implementation of the Ordinance would not result in adverse cumulative effects. The Ordinance is a financing mechanism for the development of residential units.

- D. Does the project have environmental effects which would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

— — X

Implementation of the Ordinance would not result in direct or indirect significant adverse environmental effects on human beings.

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

REFERENCES

I. Aesthetics / Neighborhood Character

- ___ City of San Diego Progress Guide and General Plan.
- ___ Community Plan.
- ___ Local Coastal Plan.

II. Agricultural Resources / Natural Resources / Mineral Resources

- ___ City of San Diego Progress Guide and General Plan.
- ___ U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey - San Diego Area, California, Part I and II, 1973.
- ___ California Department of Conservation - Division of Mines and Geology, Mineral Land Classification.
- ___ Division of Mines and Geology, Special Report 153 - Significant Resources Maps.
- ___ _____

III. Air

- ___ California Clean Air Act Guidelines (Indirect Source Control Programs) 1990.
- ___ Regional Air Quality Strategies (RAQS) - APCD.
- ___ Site Specific Report: _____

IV. Biology

- ___ City of San Diego, Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP), Subarea Plan, 1997
- ___ City of San Diego, MSCP, "Vegetation Communities with Sensitive Species and Vernal Pools" maps, 1996.
- ___ City of San Diego, MSCP, "Multiple Habitat Planning Area" maps, 1997.
- ___ Community Plan - Resource Element.

_____ California Department of Fish and Game, California Natural Diversity Database, "State and Federally-listed Endangered, Threatened, and Rare Plants of California," January 2001.

_____ California Department of Fish & Game, California Natural Diversity Database, "State and Federally-listed Endangered and Threatened Animals of California," January 2001.

_____ City of San Diego Land Development Code Biology Guidelines.

_____ Site Specific Report: _____

V. Energy

_____ _____

VI. Geology/Soils

_____ City of San Diego Seismic Safety Study.

_____ U.S. Department of Agriculture Soil Survey - San Diego Area, California, Part I and II, December 1973 and Part III, 1975.

_____ Site Specific Report: _____

VII. Historical Resources

_____ City of San Diego Historical Resources Guidelines.

_____ City of San Diego Archaeology Library.

_____ Historical Resources Board List.

_____ Community Historical Survey: _____

_____ Site Specific Report: _____

VIII. Human Health / Public Safety / Hazardous Materials

_____ San Diego County Hazardous Materials Environmental Assessment Listing, 1996.

_____ San Diego County Hazardous Materials Management Division

_____ FAA Determination

___ State Assessment and Mitigation, Unauthorized Release Listing, Public Use Authorized 1995.

___ Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan.

___ Site Specific Report: _____

IX. Hydrology/Water Quality

___ Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM).

___ Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), National Flood Insurance Program - Flood Boundary and Floodway Map.

___ Clean Water Act Section 303(b) list, dated May 19, 1999, http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/tmdl/303d_lists.html.

X. Land Use

___ City of San Diego Progress Guide and General Plan.

___ Community Plan.

___ Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan

___ City of San Diego Zoning Maps

___ FAA Determination

XI. Noise

___ Community Plan

___ Site Specific Report: _____.

___ San Diego International Airport - Lindbergh Field CNEL Maps.

___ Brown Field Airport Master Plan CNEL Maps.

___ Montgomery Field CNEL Maps.

___ San Diego Association of Governments - San Diego Regional Average Weekday Traffic Volumes.

___ San Diego Metropolitan Area Average Weekday Traffic Volume Maps, SANDAG.

___ City of San Diego Progress Guide and General Plan.

___ Site Specific Report: _____

XII. Paleontological Resources

___ City of San Diego Paleontological Guidelines.

___ Thomas A., and Stephen L. Walsh, "Paleontological Resources City of San Diego," Department of Paleontology San Diego Natural History Museum, 1996.

___ Kennedy, Michael P., and Gary L. Peterson, "Geology of the San Diego Metropolitan Area, California. Del Mar, La Jolla, Point Loma, La Mesa, Poway, and SW 1/4 Escondido 7 1/2 Minute Quadrangles," California Division of Mines and Geology Bulletin 200, Sacramento, 1975.

___ Kennedy, Michael P., and Siang S. Tan, "Geology of National City, Imperial Beach and Otay Mesa Quadrangles, Southern San Diego Metropolitan Area, California," Map Sheet 29, 1977.

___ Site Specific Report: _____

XIII. Population / Housing

___ City of San Diego Progress Guide and General Plan.

___ Community Plan.

___ Series 8 Population Forecasts, SANDAG.

X Other: San Diego Housing Commission Inclusionary Housing Ordinance

XIV. Public Services

___ City of San Diego Progress Guide and General Plan.

___ Community Plan.

XV. Recreational Resources

___ City of San Diego Progress Guide and General Plan.

___ Community Plan.

___ Department of Park and Recreation

____ City of San Diego - San Diego Regional Bicycling Map

____ Additional Resources: _____

XVI. Transportation / Circulation

____ City of San Diego Progress Guide and General Plan.

____ Community Plan.

____ San Diego Metropolitan Area Average Weekday Traffic Volume Maps, SANDAG.

____ San Diego Region Weekday Traffic Volumes, SANDAG.

____ Site Specific Report: _____

XVII. Utilities

____ _____

XVIII. Water Conservation

____ Sunset Magazine, New Western Garden Book. Rev. ed. Menlo Park, CA: Sunset Magazine.